



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/903,453	07/29/1997	LEONARD FORBES	303.378US1	2271

7590 03/18/2002

SCHWEGMAN LUNDBERG WOESSNER & KLUTH
PO BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

ECKERT II, GEORGE C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2815	

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No. 08/903,453	Applicant(s) Forbes et al.
Examiner George C. Eckert II	Group Art Unit 2815



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) George C. Eckert II

(3) _____

(2) Mr. Robert E. Mates

(4) _____

Date of Interview Mar 14, 2002

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: All

Identification of prior art discussed:

Sakata et al. and Sugita et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The essential rejection is based on Sakata, incorporating Sugita for the teaching of source/drain regions. Mr. Mates argued that Sakata and Sugita were not combinable as they teach functionally different devices. Mr. Mates argued that the device of Sakata did not need source/drain regions, or at least it was not obvious based on Sugita to form them in the device of Sakata. The examiner did not agree because Sakata clearly teaches the use of the SiC as applied to a floating gate memory device (p. 688, col. 1). And, as is known in the art and taught by Sugita, floating gate memory devices use sources and drains. The motivation for using the sources and drains being that they allow formation of arrays of such memory devices. Mr. Mates argued that, absent an express teaching in Sakata, and absent an express suggestion to combine from Sugita, the rejection is in error. Mr. Mates also cited the recent Fed. Cir. case In re Sang Su Lee as an additional basis for arguments. The examiner has a copy of In re Sang Su Lee.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

GEORGE C. ECKERT II
PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.